

### III. ASSESSMENT OF NEED FOR RECREATION AMENITIES AND FACILITIES

This section discusses the community's need for outdoor recreation amenities, recreation facilities, and natural area amenities within the parks and open space system. For each amenity and facility type, public involvement findings and trends are noted. Sub-area findings are presented for each amenity, accounting for City-owned facilities, but not those maintained by schools or other providers. Potential partners are identified where applicable, and proposed minimum level of service is presented. A complete inventory of amenities and facilities is found in Appendix C sorted by park classification and in Appendix D sorted by planning sub-area.

Table 3 describes the proposed level of service and anticipated need for amenities and facilities in Eugene. To establish a new level of service for Eugene, the current level of service was compared to Oregon average standards and historic NRPA standards. It should be noted that for many of the amenities, there are no comparable standards available. Community demand was considered in developing a proposed level of service for each amenity, which is expressed in units per population. In some cases, such as sports facilities, mathematical models provide guidance and are used to assess need. School district amenities have not been included in the calculation of need for a number of amenities they commonly provide, including basketball courts, children's play areas, community gardens, sand volleyball, soccer, softball/baseball, tennis courts, and gymnasiums. This is due to the difficulty in establishing a clear equivalent between facilities provided by the City that are accessible to the entire community, and those that may provide a lower level of service based on access, schedule, or condition. However, in each case, the school districts' current inventory of these amenities has been provided as a tool in estimating the total need and the availability of existing resources. The proposed levels of service for each of the amenities outlined below are intended to serve as tools to address future needs, rather than be adopted as formal standards.

The inventory contained in Appendix C was used as a basis for determining the current level of service. Table 4 provides a summary of amenities provided by other agencies in the Eugene area, including agencies such as Lane County, EWEB, and local school districts. These amenities also contribute to the inventory of recreation amenities and, to a varying degree, are available to the Eugene residents.

#### A. Outdoor Recreation Amenities

The City of Eugene provides a variety of outdoor recreation amenities to support participation in specific recreation activities.

The following outdoor recreation amenities are addressed in this report:

- Basketball courts
- Botanical gardens
- Children's play areas
- Community gardens
- Disc golf courses
- Dog parks
- Golf courses
- Performance space
- Picnic areas (reservable)
- Sand volleyball
- Skate parks
- Soccer
- Softball/baseball
- Tennis courts
- Wading pools/spray parks



Insert **TABLE 3**



Table 3 back



Facility	# Provided by Others								TOTAL by Others
	U of O	EWEB	LC Parks	LC Fair	WPRD	RRPRD	4J	52	
OUTDOOR RECREATION AMENITIES									
Basketball - Full Court	6				9	1	0	0	16
Basketball - Half Court	4				6	1	30	11	52
Botanical Gardens			1			0	0	0	1
Children's Play Areas			1		18	1	17	7	44
Community Gardens					1	0	1	0	2
Disc Golf Courses						0	0	0	0
Dog Parks					0	0	0	0	0
Golf Courses						0	0	0	0
Performance Space	2					0	0	0	2
Sand Volleyball	1				2	0	3	0	6
Skate Parks					1	1	0	0	2
Soccer	1				4	0	52	10	67
Softball/Baseball	1				13	0	46	14	74
Tennis Courts	2				12	0	4	0	18
Wading Pools/Spray Parks		1			0	0	0	0	1
Reservable Picnic Areas			8			1	0	0	9
TRAILS (in miles)									
Trails, Multi-Use					3.50	0	0	0	3.50
Trails, Mountain Bike						0	0	0	0
Trails, Running	1					1	0	0	2
Trails, Pedestrian						0	0	0	0
RECREATION FACILITIES									
Gymnasiums				1	1		37	12	51
Indoor and Outdoor Swimming Pools					2	1			3
Community Centers/Senior Centers					3	1			4

Table 4: Amenities Provided by Others

Key to Acronyms:

U of O	University of Oregon
EWEB	Eugene Water & Electric Board
LC Parks	Lane County Parks Division
LC Fair	Lane County Fair (Lane Events Center)
WPRD	Willamalane Park and Recreation District
RRPRD	River Road Park and Recreation District
4J	Eugene School District 4J
52	Bethel School District 52

### ***Basketball Courts***

The outdoor basketball courts in Eugene can be found in two different configurations: full-court and half-court. Currently, there are a total of 38 full- and half-courts owned and managed by the City of Eugene. An additional 41 courts are located at various school sites scattered throughout the community. Most of these are half-court configurations. One site, Washington/Jefferson Park, provides sheltered and lit basketball for full-time play. In general, City-owned outdoor basketball courts are in fairly good condition, with average ratings ranging from 2 (fair) to 3 (good) (See Appendix E for a discussion of the ranking scale and the ratings for each park site.) Improvements to these types of facilities would consist of repairs of hairline cracks and court resurfacing.

### ***Public Involvement Findings/Trends***

- Basketball is the number one preferred activity for youth, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire. Basketball ranked 5<sup>th</sup> in terms of actual participation out of 50 choices, with a participation rate of 7.10 times in a 30-day period.
- Basketball is the highest-ranking adult sports activity as well. Basketball ranked 27th out of 50 activities in the Community Survey. Although Eugene's participation in basketball is lower than the Northwest Average, respondents indicated they would like to spend more time playing basketball than they currently do.
- Overall, a sports complex is the most needed sports facility in Eugene, according to 24.7% of the respondents to the Community Survey. Over 10% of respondents specifically noted the need for more outdoor basketball courts.
- Outdoor basketball courts were the third most needed sports facility, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- Nationally, participation in basketball has increased 3% since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- The participation rates for outdoor basketball have increased 31.2% in the Eugene area from 1987-2002 (OPRD, 2003).
- The River Road/Santa Clara sub-area has few City-owned basketball facilities (full and half court).

### ***Potential Partners***

Schools, private businesses and developers are important potential partners.

### ***Standards Analysis***

Excluding school facilities, the City currently provides a service level of one basketball court per 4,200 people (refer to Table 3). If school facilities are included, the current level of service is 1 court per 2,000 people.

In general, there is a community wide need for additional outdoor basketball courts, both in full-court and half-court configurations. Design programs for active use parks (e.g., neighborhood, community, and metropolitan) and nearly all schools typically include outdoor basketball courts as a basic component of their design. In Eugene, the following characteristics exist:

- Of the 50 neighborhood parks, 17 of the sites contain outdoor basketball courts.
- Six of the 10 community parks and one of the metropolitan parks contain basketball facilities.
- Approximately half of the facilities are full court facilities.

Based on the analysis of neighborhood and community/metropolitan parks (refer to Section II), we know there is a need for 37 additional neighborhood parks and 1 additional community park. Each of these parks would most likely contain a basketball court as part of their development. It is



also assumed that basketball courts could be added to several existing neighborhood parks. Currently, 33 neighborhood and four community parks do not have basketball facilities.

Assuming additional courts will be developed at some existing neighborhood and all of the community parks and at each of the 38 future parks, one could expect to see 50 additional courts developed. If this figure is added to the existing inventory of courts (38 courts) and then divided into the future population, a proposed level of service of one outdoor basketball court per 2,400 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, 29 courts are currently needed and 50 courts will be needed by the year 2025. The 41 school district basketball facilities should be further assessed to determine how they may meet a portion of this need.

This level of service (LOS) is higher than the current level of service (1 court per 4,200 people), but about average of other Oregon communities. At one time, NRPA had established a guideline of 1 court per 5,000 people, but this has been determined to be insufficient in many communities.

### ***Botanical Gardens***

A wide variety of botanical gardens can be provided, and the gardens can emphasize native or ornamental plant materials. Currently, there are five areas within the Eugene area that contain botanic gardens: Scobert Gardens, Alton Baker Park, Hendricks Park Rhododendron Garden and Native Plant Garden, and the Owen Rose Garden. While no specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of botanical gardens, staff reports that all but four of these facilities are in good condition, and two are in poor to fair condition (Scobert and the Ken Nielsen Garden at Alton Baker Park).

### ***Public Involvement Findings/Trends***

- Community residents have a strong appreciation for gardens and gardening. According to the results of the Community Survey, gardening ranked 7th out of 50 activities in current recreation participation. Although this participation rate is lower than the Northwest Average, community members reported they would like to participate more in gardening.
- Eugene's botanical gardens were mentioned by the Business Community Focus Group as an excellent example of community assets that provide economic benefit to Eugene's residents, employers, and business owners.
- Seniors (65+) participate in gardening most frequently, according to the Community Survey.
- The following sub-areas have no botanical gardens: Bethel-Danebo, River Road/Santa Clara, and Willow Creek. However, these facilities are generally regional in nature.

### ***Potential Partners***

Gardening and horticultural clubs, such as the Master Gardeners, the Hardy Plant Society, the Native Plant Society, and the Rhododendron and Rose Societies, are potential partners.

### ***Standards Analysis***

Currently, the City provides a level of service of one botanical garden per 32,000 people (Table 3).

The City of Eugene already has a considerable number of botanical gardens with five existing areas. These types of facilities are generally regional attractions and/or serve the community as a whole. At a minimum, the current level of service should be maintained at 1 garden per 32,000 people. As the City experiences future population growth, demand for additional botanical garden space will increase. The City can then reexamine the geographic distribution of these facilities and explore alternatives to provide convenient access to these types of facilities in all planning sub-areas. The condition of the existing gardens should also be evaluated to determine future needs for renovations. Based on the current level of service, no botanical gardens are currently needed, and two additional areas will be needed by the year 2025.



There have been no comparable standards developed for botanical garden areas.

### **Children's Play Areas**

Children's play areas occur in all shapes and sizes. They can contain one or multiple design components. Playgrounds can also be designed to incorporate thematic play areas that focus on interpretive and educational elements. In Eugene, there are 42 City-owned play areas and an additional 24 school playgrounds. In general, City-owned play areas are in fair condition, with average ratings ranging from 1.7 to 2.7 (Appendix E). Most of the play areas require improvements for ADA access, drainage, material deterioration, and minor safety compliance issues. Based on the evaluation, the play areas at metropolitan parks have the greatest need for improvements.

### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- According to the results of the Community Survey, 20.6% of respondents believe that playgrounds and a regional-scale children's play area are the most needed outdoor recreation elements in Eugene. Combined they become the second highest priority for outdoor improvements.
- Visiting/playing on playgrounds was in the top 10 recreation activities in the Community Survey. Playing on playgrounds ranked 10th out of 50 activities, with an average of 2.09 per capita visits in a 30-day period.
- Middle school and high school youth averaged 3.73 visits to playgrounds in a 30-day period, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire. Playing on playgrounds ranked 16<sup>th</sup> out of 50 recreation activities.
- According to the Community Survey, youth ages 10-14 play on playgrounds more frequently than other age groups.
- When asked to suggest ideas for improving parks and natural areas in Eugene, youth most frequently listed in open-ended responses a need for more/better playground equipment, more facilities, more basketball courts, and more interesting "funner" stuff.
- Since 1987, the use of playground equipment has increased 113.9% in the Eugene region (OPRD, 2003).
- The River Road/Santa Clara sub-area has few City-owned children's play areas.

### *Potential Partners*

Schools, developers, and local service groups are all potential partners.

### *Standards Analysis*

Excluding school facilities, the City currently provides a service level of one children's play area per 3,800 people (Table 3). If school facilities are included, the current level of service is 1 play area per 2,400 people.

In general, there appears to be a community-wide need for additional playgrounds. This is due, in part, to the fact that several of the existing neighborhood and community parks lack children's play areas. Generally, this is one of the fundamental design components of active parks (e.g., neighborhood, community and metropolitan parks). Schools, primarily elementary, also provide playground areas as part of their development programs. In Eugene, the following characteristics exist:

- Of the 50 neighborhood parks, 31 of the sites contain playgrounds.
- Six of the 10 community parks and two of the metropolitan parks contain children's playground facilities.



Based on the analysis of neighborhood and community/metropolitan parks (refer to Section II), we know there is a need for 37 additional neighborhood parks and one additional community park. Assuming a playground component is developed at each of these sites, there will eventually be an additional 38 children's playground areas. In addition, several neighborhood, community and metropolitan parks lack playground facilities. This includes 19 neighborhood parks, four community parks and one metropolitan park (Alton Baker Park).

Assuming 38 play areas at future parks and 24 play areas at existing parks (deficient sites only), one could expect to see an additional 62 children's play areas developed. If this figure is added to the existing inventory of 42 children's play areas and then divided into the future population, a proposed level of service of 1 play area per 2,000 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, 38 play areas are currently needed and 63 areas will be needed by the year 2025. The 24 play areas on school district properties should be further assessed to determine how they might meet a portion of this need.

This LOS is higher than the current level of service of 1 playground area per 3,800 residents.

### **Community Gardens**

Community gardens can be a single plot or consist of multiple plots. In Eugene, community gardens are currently located at six sites: Lincoln School, Amazon, Alton Baker, Maurie Jacobs, Skinner Butte and Garfield. In addition, there is one site located at Churchill High School. No specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of these facilities.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Gardening ranked 7th out of 50 activities in current recreation participation among residents in the Community Survey. Although this participation rate is lower than the Northwest Average, community members would like to participate more in gardening.
- Seniors (65+) participate in gardening most frequently, according to the Community Survey.
- According to the results of the Youth Questionnaire, gardening ranked 36<sup>th</sup> out of 50 recreation activities in which youth participate.
- Only 6.8% of respondents in the Community Survey indicated that community gardens are the most needed recreation element in Eugene. The other 7 choices were ranked higher.
- Community gardening programs can provide many of the benefits most desired by the community, including: *provide opportunities to enjoy nature/outdoors, connect people together, building stronger families and neighborhoods, improve health and wellness, and promote youth development.*
- Youth have been involved in community gardening through Food for Lane County and Northwest Youth Corp.
- Some schools have developed community gardens.
- The River Road/Santa Clara sub-area has no City-owned community gardens. The South Eugene and Willakenzie sub-areas have only one garden each, which is insufficient for those areas.

#### *Potential Partners*

Schools, nonprofit organizations, such as Food for Lane County, and private developments are potential partners.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City provides a current level of service of one community garden per 23,000 people (Table 3). As the City grows, and neighborhoods become denser, private yards will get smaller. This will contribute to an increased need for community gardening facilities.





For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, we will assume that two community gardens will be developed in each of the six park planning sub-areas. Based on this assumption, a total of 12 areas will eventually be needed. If this number is divided by the projected 2025 people (per 1,000 people), a level of service of 1 community garden per 17,500 people can be derived. Since the current level of service is only 1 per 23,000, an increased level of service of 1 per 20,000 people is proposed. Based on this level of service, one community garden area is needed at the present time and four additional areas will be needed by the year 2025.

This LOS is slightly higher than the current level of service of 1 garden area per 23,000 residents.

### ***Disc Golf Courses***

Disc golf courses can be arranged in a variety of different configurations and lengths. Currently, there are two parks with disc golf facilities in the Eugene planning area. These are located at Sladden Park and Westmoreland Park. The facilities at Sladden Park include three holes and provide play at the neighborhood scale. Westmoreland Park offers a full 9-hole disc golf course. A portion of Laurelwood Golf Course is also used consistently for disc golf, but no formal facilities have been installed. No specific evaluation was conducted on these facilities.

### ***Public Involvement Findings/Trends***

- According to the Community Survey, disc golf and Ultimate Frisbee ranked 38<sup>th</sup> and 49<sup>th</sup> respectively out of 50 activities in which people participate.
- In the Youth Questionnaire, participation trends were similar, with disc golf and Ultimate Frisbee ranking 46<sup>th</sup> and 49<sup>th</sup> respectively.
- In an open-ended question, Speakers Bureau respondents cited disc golf more frequently than any other outdoor sports facilities as the type of recreation element most needed in Eugene.
- Disc golf and Ultimate Frisbee are gaining in popularity in Eugene, according to the results of the Organized Sports Questionnaire.
- Availability of fields may limit the growth in disc golf and Ultimate Frisbee.
- The following sub-areas have no City-owned facilities for disc golf: Bethel-Danebo, River Road/Santa Clara, Willakenzie, and Willow Creek.

### ***Potential Partners***

Lane County Parks, Oregon State Parks, Willamalane Park and Recreation District, schools and private developers may be potential partners.

### ***Standards Analysis***

The City provides a current level of service of one disc golf facility per 80,200 people (Table 3).

For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, we will assume that disc golf facilities will be developed in each of the six park planning sub-areas. Based on this assumption, a total of 6 areas will eventually be needed. If this number is divided by the projected 2025 population, a proposed level of service of 1 per 35,100 people can be derived. Further evaluation will be necessary to determine if these will be formal 9-hole courses, or if other configurations are appropriate. Based on this level of service, 3 areas are currently needed and 4 areas will be needed by the year 2025.

This LOS is significantly higher than the current level of service of 1 disc golf course per 80,200 residents.



## **Dog Parks**

The need for a dog park or designated off-leash areas can be addressed in a number of different ways. In some instances, entire parks can be devoted to dog walking. In other cases, a specific area within a park is designated for off-leash use. Currently, there are three formal dog parks/off-leash areas in the City of Eugene. These are located at Wayne Morse Ranch, Amazon Park, and Alton Baker Park. Informal facilities are provided at Candlelight Park. No specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of these facilities.

### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Fenced, off-leash dog parks were mentioned by 9.5% of respondents in the Community Survey as the most needed recreation element in Eugene. This response ranked 5th out of 9 choices.
- Dog walking ranked 8<sup>th</sup> in terms of current participation out of 50 recreation activities in the Community Survey. In the Youth Questionnaire, dog walking was the 13<sup>th</sup> highest-ranking activity.
- The following sub-areas have no City-owned, off-leash dog parks: Bethel-Danebo, City Central, River Road/Santa Clara, and Willow Creek. Concept plans for Candlelight Park and Bethel Community Park include off-leash dog parks within the current program. These parks are both located within the Bethel-Danebo planning sub-area.

### *Potential Partners*

Other providers, such as Lane County Parks and River Road Park and Recreation District, are potential partners.

### *Standards Analysis*

Currently, the City provides a level of service of one dog park per 53,500 people (Table 3).

For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, we will assume that one designated off-leash area be developed in each of the six park planning sub-areas. Based on this assumption, a total of 6 areas will eventually be needed. If the projected 2025 population is divided by six, a proposed level of service of 1 dog park/off-leash area per 35,100 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, 2 additional areas are currently needed and 3 areas will be needed by the year 2025.

This LOS is higher than the current level of service of 1 dog park/off-leash area per 53,500 residents.

## **Golf Courses**

Typical golf course configurations include executive, 9-hole, and 18-hole courses. In Eugene, there is one City-owned 9-hole golf course, which is the Laurelwood Golf Course. According to the Facility Condition Report, the driving range, storage garage, and maintenance building at the Laurelwood Golf Course are in poor condition and need costly repairs (Appendix G). In addition, the irrigation system needs to be replaced. The clubhouse and restroom are in good condition.

### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Golf ranked 28th out of 50 activities in which people participate, according to the results of the Community Survey. The participation rate in Eugene is higher than in the Willamalane Park and Recreation District and slightly greater than the Northwest Average.
- In the Youth Questionnaire, golf ranked 35th out of 50 recreation activities.
- Nationally, participation in golf has increased 6.1% since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- The SCORP identifies a need for golf in Region 2, which includes Eugene. Golf scored highest on the Relative Needs Priority Index, because current peak use greatly exceeds supply in the Eugene area (OPRD, 2003).



- The participation rates for golf have increased 224.1% in the Eugene area from 1987-2002 (OPRD, 2003).
- The only public golf course is located in the South Eugene sub-area. The shortage of public golf courses may limit participation in golf.
- Some agencies provide golf courses as a revenue-generating activity that helps finance activities that are less self-sustaining, such as senior services. Revenue-generating golf courses are typically 18-hole courses.

#### *Potential Partners*

Lane County Parks and private developers are potential partners. Current private courses serving the Eugene area include Oakway, RiverRidge, Eugene Country Club, and Fiddler's Green.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City provides a current level of service of one public golf course per 160,500 people (Table 3).

Based on the demand documented above, at least one additional course is currently needed. If the projected 2025 population is divided by two, a proposed level of service of 1 golf course per 105,500 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, 1 additional public course is needed to meet the current and future needs at year 2025.

This proposed LOS is higher than the current level of service of 1 golf course per 160,500 residents.

#### **Performance Space**

Performance space can take form in a variety of different configurations and sizes. Some spaces may be covered and able to accommodate hundreds of people, while others may cater to small outdoor groups. Currently, performance space is offered at 17 locations. These are scattered throughout four different park types: neighborhood parks, community parks, metropolitan parks, and special use facilities. According to the Facility Condition Report, the Cuthbert Amphitheater and the University Park Amphitheater shelter are in good condition (Appendix G). No other performance spaces were rated individually.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Performance spaces may support a number of recreation activities that are among the top 20 most popular in Eugene: family activities (6), fairs and festivals (14), attending concerts (16), and attending cultural events (19).
- Respondents to the Community Survey indicated a desire to spend more time attending concerts and cultural events than they currently do.
- The age groups most likely to use concert venues frequently are youths aged 10-14 and seniors (65+).
- Attending concerts is one of the top 20 recreation activities in which youths participate. Concerts ranked 17th out of 50 activities, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- Youth would like to spend more time dancing, attending concerts, and participating in fairs and festivals than they currently do, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- Youth ranked special events second (behind sports) as the most needed recreation activity in Eugene, according to responses in the Youth Questionnaire.
- Fairs and festivals are the 10th top activity in which adults age 55+ participate.



- On average, people attend more cultural events (but not concerts) in Eugene than the Northwest Average, according to the results of the Community Survey.
- Concert venues, such as the Hult Center and Cuthbert, are used less frequently than many other parks and community facilities. According to the Community Survey, respondents averaged 3.22 per capita visits annually. Youth averaged 3.84 visits annually.
- Special events (concerts in the park, festivals) ranked as one of the top two types of programs that the City should increase, according to the Community Survey and the Speakers Bureau Report.
- In the Community Survey, respondents ranked areas for special events and festivals as their sixth choice for outdoor recreation elements most needed in Eugene (out of 9). It ranked 8 out of 10 in the Youth Questionnaire, and 9 out of 10 in the Eugene Celebration.
- Planning more special events, concerts, and festivals was a priority service improvement identified at the LRCS All-staff Workshop.
- The River Road/Santa Clara sub-area has no City-owned performance spaces. The Willow Creek sub-area has one performance space, which is insufficient for that area.

#### *Potential Partners*

School districts and other recreation providers are potential partners.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City provides a current level of service of one performance area per 9,400 people (Table 3).

In an effort to balance the geographic sub-area needs, we will assume that three additional performances spaces are needed (three in the River Road/Santa Clara area and two in the Willow Creek area). Based on this assumption, a total of 22 areas will eventually be needed. If the projected 2025 population is divided by 22, a proposed level of service of 1 performance space per 9,600 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, no performance spaces are currently needed, however five additional spaces will be needed by the year 2025.

This LOS closely reflects the current level of service of 1 performance space per 9,400 residents.

#### ***Picnic Areas (Reservable)***

Reservable picnic areas occur in all shapes and sizes. They can be designed to accommodate a single table or groupings of several tables. They often have access to utilities and include a variety of support facilities, such as barbecues, drinking fountains, and trash receptacles. In Eugene, there are seven reservable picnic areas: two in neighborhood parks, one in a community park, and four in metropolitan parks. In general, picnic facilities are in fair condition, with an average rating ranging from 2.1 to 2.3 (Appendix E). Most of the facilities require improvements associated with lack of support facilities, such as barbecues, drinking fountains, and trash receptacles, or repairs based on the condition of the tables. According to the Facility Condition Report, all of the City's rentable facilities and most shelters are in good condition (Appendix G).

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Picnicking ranked 21<sup>st</sup> out of 50 recreation activities in which Community Survey respondents participate. For youth, picnicking ranked 34<sup>th</sup>, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- Many families enjoy picnicking together. According to the results of the Community Survey, family activities ranked 6th in terms of current participation. Youths ranked family activities 10th out of 50 recreation activities, according to responses in the Youth Questionnaire.



- Picnicking provides two of the top benefits of parks, recreation, and open space, including: *provide opportunities to enjoy nature/outdoors* and *connect people together, building stronger families and neighborhoods*, according to responses in the Community Survey, Eugene Celebration, and Speakers Bureau Report.
- Providing appropriate spaces for family gatherings, large group picnics, and events was a priority improvement discussed in the Multi-Cultural Focus Group.
- Participation in picnicking has stayed relatively consistent (-0.1%) in the Eugene region from 1987-2002 (OPRD, 2003).
- The City Center, River Road/Santa Clara, and Willow Creek planning sub-areas have no City-owned reservable picnic areas. However, the River Road Park and Recreation District provides reservable shelters within their district.

#### *Potential Partners*

Other recreation providers, such as Willamalane Park and Recreation District, Lane County Parks, and River Road Park and Recreation District are potential partners.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City provides a current level of service of one reservable picnic space per 23,000 residents (Table 3).

There appears to be a community-wide need for reservable picnic facilities. Design programs for community and metropolitan parks generally include reservable (group) picnic areas as a basic component of the park design. These park amenities have the potential for revenue generation.

Based on an analysis of community service areas, we know there is a need for one additional community park. In addition, nine of the existing community parks do not contain group picnic areas. If reservable picnic facilities were added to each of these sites (or to other suitable park sites), ten additional areas could be provided. If this figure is added to the existing inventory of picnic areas (7 areas) and divided into the future population, a proposed level of service of one reservable picnic area per 12,500 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, six reservable areas are currently needed and 10 areas will be needed by the year 2025.

This LOS doubles the current level of service of 1 area per 23,000 residents.

#### ***Sand Volleyball***

Sand volleyball courts are generally constructed in pairs and can be found in larger park types, such as community and metropolitan parks. Currently, there are six sand volleyball courts located in Eugene parks: four courts at Amazon Park, one court at Washington/Jefferson Park, and one at Lincoln School Park. The sand volleyball courts in Eugene are located in differing types of parks: neighborhood, community, and metropolitan parks. No specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of these types of facilities.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- According to the results of the Community Survey, outdoor/sand volleyball ranked 41st out of 50 activities. Eugene's participation rate is higher than the Northwest Average and that of Willamalane Parks and Recreation District.
- In the Youth Questionnaire, sand volleyball ranked 44th out of 50 recreation activities.
- Oregon has a much higher participation rate in volleyball compared to other states (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- Nationally, participation in volleyball has decreased 4.8% since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).



- Participation rates in volleyball have decreased by over 30% in the Eugene area from 1987-2002 (OPRD, 2003).
- The following planning sub-areas have no City-owned sand volleyball courts: Bethel-Danebo, River Road/Santa Clara, Willakenzie, and Willow Creek. However, the River Road Park and Recreation District maintains one.

#### *Potential Partners*

Schools and other recreation providers, such as Willamalane Park and Recreation District, Lane County Parks, and River Road Park and Recreation District, are potential partners.

#### *Standards Analysis*

Excluding school facilities, the City currently provides a service level of one sand volleyball court per 26,800 people (Table 3). If school facilities are included, the current level of service is 1 court per 17,800 people.

Sand volleyball courts are generally located in larger parks such as community and metropolitan parks. In an effort to balance the geographic distribution of sand volleyball courts, it is assumed that a pair of courts is needed in each of the six park planning sub-areas. Based on this, a total of 12 sand volleyball courts will eventually be needed in the community. If this figure is divided into the future population, a proposed level of service of 1 sand volleyball court per 17,500 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, three courts are currently needed and six courts will be needed by the year 2025. The 3 sand volleyball courts on school district property can be assumed to meet the current need, not accounting for geographical distribution.

This LOS is service is comparable to the current level of service of 1 court per 17,800 residents. NRPA recommends a guideline of one court per 5,000 people, however this standard would be more appropriate in warmer climates where outdoor volleyball is played year round.

#### **Skate Parks**

Skate parks can either be independent facilities or part of larger community or metropolitan parks. Smaller skating facilities can be incorporated into neighborhood parks. Some facilities consist of elaborate pipes and ramps while others have limited features. In Eugene, there are five skate parks: four located in community parks and one in Trainsong, a neighborhood park. The four community-scale parks are concrete, while the Trainsong course features a modular system. No specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of these types of facilities. However, four of the five parks have been constructed since 2000 and are assumed to be in good condition.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Participation rates in skateboarding are significantly higher for youths in Eugene. According to the results in the Youth Questionnaire, skateboarding ranked 23rd out of 50 activities. Older youths aged 15-17, had a higher participation rate than youths aged 10-14.
- According to the results in the Community Survey, skateboarding is the least popular recreation activity in terms of participation. Although it ranked 50th out of 50 activities, Eugene's participation rate is higher than the Northwest Average.
- Skateparks are the third-ranking type of facility (out of 8) most needed by youths in Eugene, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- Nationally, participation in skateboarding has increased 0.5% since 2001. In-line roller skating has decreased 2% (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- The City Central and River Road/Santa Clara planning sub-areas have no City-owned skate parks. However, the River Road Park and Recreation District maintains one.





- Staff note consistent demand for all-weather skating facilities, such as an indoor or covered course. Staff have also noted a trend for increased use of skateboard facilities by BMX and freestyle bikers.

#### *Potential Partners*

Schools and other recreation providers, such as Willamalane Park and Recreation District, Lane County Parks, and River Road Park and Recreation District, are potential partners. Willamalane and River Road have both recently constructed skate board parks.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City currently provides a current level of service of one skate park per 32,100 people (Table 3).

For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, we will assume that one community-scale and one neighborhood-scale skate area be developed in each of the six park planning sub-areas. Based on this assumption, a total of 12 areas will eventually be needed. If the projected 2025 population is divided by twelve, a proposed level of service of 1 skate area per 17,500 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, four skate parks are currently needed and 7 skate areas will be needed by the year 2025. Serving the City Central sub-area should be a priority.

This LOS proposes to nearly double the current level of service of 1 skate area per 32,100 residents.

#### **Soccer**

Soccer fields can be developed in a variety of different sizes and can be modified to accommodate limited space and other uses. In addition to youth and adult soccer, these fields provide facilities for football, ultimate frisbee, rugby, field hockey, and lacrosse, as well as unprogrammed play. In Eugene, there are currently 15 City-owned soccer fields (4 dedicated fields and 11 fields overlaid on ball field outfields). An additional 52 fields of various size and condition are located at local schools. Typically, soccer fields in Eugene are overlaid with other types of fields to maximize flexibility and play. For example, many soccer fields are located within the outfields of softball and baseball fields. In these cases, the inventory has included counts for the soccer and the softball/baseball fields. Four of the City fields are all-weather synthetic surface fields that are shared with School District 4J.

In general, City-owned soccer fields are in fair condition, with average ratings ranging from 1.5 to 2.7 (Appendix E). Most of the fields require improvements associated with irrigation, turf, drainage, and slope modification. Based on the evaluation, the fields at the metropolitan and neighborhood parks have the greatest need for improvements; the fields in community parks were rated fair to good.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Soccer is an important youth sport, ranking 14th out of 50 activities in which youths participate, according to results of the Youth Questionnaire. According to the Community Survey, youths aged 10-14 play soccer more frequently than any other age group.
- In the community overall, soccer ranked 29<sup>th</sup> out of 50 activities, which is lower than the Northwest Average.
- There are many opportunities for youths to participate in soccer in Eugene. This sport has the most recreation providers (9), including 5 high schools and 4 private organizations.
- Local recreation providers noted that adults are participating in active recreation longer in the Eugene area. However, more sports opportunities in Eugene are available for youths than adults, according to the results of the Organized Sports Questionnaire.



- Organized Sports Providers indicated that participation in soccer is growing, and there is a need for more athletic facilities in Eugene to accommodate the demand. According to the results of the Organized Sports Questionnaire, Eugene needs more sports fields, improvements in existing fields, and a sports field complex.
- A sports complex is the most needed sports facility in Eugene, according to 24.7% of the respondents to the Community Survey. Over 6% of respondents specified a need for more soccer fields.
- Nationally, participation in soccer has increased 4.7% since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003). Participation rates for soccer have increased 78.3% in the Eugene area from 1987-2002 (OPRD, 2003).
- Throughout the northwest, interest in lacrosse is gaining in popularity. Locally, interest in ultimate frisbee in Eugene remains strong.
- Soccer, in general, appeals to a diverse demographic group (e.g., women and men, youths and older adults, and several minorities).
- Because of the revenue generated, athletics is one of the most cost effective programs offered by the City.
- Availability of fields may limit participation and growth in soccer.
- The City Central and River Road/Santa Clara planning sub-areas have few City-owned soccer fields.
- The City and School District 4J partnered to construct four synthetic surface fields at the four 4J high schools. These synthetic surface fields help to address the issue of wet weather and poor soils that has limited the play on natural grass fields.

#### *Potential Partners*

Schools and private businesses are important potential partners.

#### *Standards Analysis*

Excluding school facilities, the City currently provides a service level of one soccer field per 10,700 people (refer to Table 3). If school facilities are included, the current level of service is 1 field per 2,400 people.

During dry months, the 15 City-owned existing fields can accommodate an average of eleven (11) games/practices per field per week for a total supply of 165 games/practices per week. Assuming an average of one game and two practices a week per team, the 374 teams (adult soccer, including high school teams, youth soccer and ultimate Frisbee) create a demand of 935 games/practices a week. These figures are considered very conservative, as they do not account for the use of soccer fields for flag and tackle football (Kidsports, Pop Warner, and Adults), rugby, and lacrosse.

Based on a supply and demand analysis, there is a current shortage of 770 games/practices a week. Since one field can accommodate an average of 11 games/practices a week, there is a shortage of 70 soccer fields. If the current shortage is added to the existing inventory of 15 fields, there is a net need for 85 (from table 3) fields at the present time. If the current population is divided by the net need, a proposed service level of one soccer field per 1,900 can be derived. Based on this level of service, 84 fields (69 net) are currently needed and 111 soccer fields (96 net) will be needed by the year 2025. The use of synthetic surface fields may significantly reduce this number. The 52 soccer fields on school district properties should be further assessed to determine how they may meet a portion of this need.

This is higher than the current level of service, but about average for other Oregon communities (1 field per 1,900 people). NRPA recommends a guideline of one field per 10,000 people. This figure





is often regarded as inadequate considering the popularity of soccer in the northwest today, and the need to address wet weather play.

### ***Softball/Baseball***

Ballfields can be developed in a variety of different sizes to accommodate different sports and varying age groups. Currently, there are 28 City-owned baseball and softball fields in the Eugene area. An additional 46 fields are located at local schools. As stated before, softball/baseball fields in Eugene are often overlaid with soccer fields to maximize flexibility and play. (In these cases, the inventory has included counts for the soccer and the softball/baseball fields.) In general, these City facilities are in fair condition, with an average rating ranging from 1.5 to 2.7 (Appendix E). Most of the fields require improvements associated with irrigation, turf, drainage, and infield soil mixture. Based on the evaluation, fields at the metropolitan and neighborhood parks have the greatest need for improvements.

### ***Public Involvement Findings/Trends***

- Baseball and softball rank 34<sup>th</sup> and 35<sup>th</sup> respectively out of 50 activities in which people participate. Participation rates for baseball and softball are lower than the Northwest Average.
- According to the results of the Youth Questionnaire, baseball and softball ranked 30<sup>th</sup> and 43<sup>rd</sup> respectively out of 50 recreation activities.
- There are many opportunities to participate in youth baseball in Eugene. There are 8 providers, including 5 high schools and 3 private organizations.
- Local recreation providers noted that adults are participating in active recreation longer in the Eugene area. However, more sports opportunities in Eugene are available for youths than adults, according to the results of the Organized Sports Questionnaire.
- Organized Sports providers report that participation in baseball is growing throughout Lane County. They indicate a need for more sports fields, improvements in existing fields, and a sports field complex in Eugene to accommodate the demand.
- A sports complex is the most needed sports facility in Eugene, according to 24.7% of the respondents to the Community Survey. Eight percent of respondents specified the need for more softball fields.
- Nationally, participation in baseball has increased 5.1% since 2001, and participation in softball has increased 3.2% (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- The participation rates for baseball and softball have increased 130.6% and 15.6% respectively in the Eugene area from 1987-2002 (OPRD, 2003).
- Because of the revenue generated, athletics is one of the most cost effective programs offered by the City.
- Availability of fields may limit participation and growth in softball/baseball.
- The River Road/Santa Clara sub-area has no City-owned baseball or softball fields. The City Central and Willakenzie sub-areas have few baseball/softball facilities.

### ***Potential Partners***

Schools, non-profits, and private businesses are important potential partners. Current non-profit partners include Kidsports, Little League, and Babe Ruth baseball organizations.

### ***Standards Analysis***

Excluding school facilities, the City currently provides a service level of one field per 5,700 people (refer to Table 3). If school facilities are included, the current level of service is 1 field per 1,800 people.



The 28 existing fields can accommodate an average of eighteen (18) games/practices per field per week for a total supply of 504 games/practices per week. Assuming one game and two practices a week per team, the 455 teams (comprised of adult, high school, and youth baseball and softball) create a demand of 1,137.5 (455 x 2 practices plus 455 x 1 game divided by 2 teams; 1 game is played by two teams therefore the number of games is divided by 2) practices aren't equivalent, i.e., the calculation is not 455 x 3, we need to explain this) games/practices a week.

Based on a supply and demand analysis, there is a shortage of 633.5 games/practices a week. Since one field can accommodate an average of eighteen (18) games/practices a week, there is a shortage of 35 ballfields. If the current shortage is added to the existing inventory of 28 fields, there is a net need for 63 fields at the present time. If the current population is divided by the net need, a proposed service level of one ballfield per 2,500 can be derived. Based on this level of service, 64 fields (36 net) are currently needed and 84 fields (56 net) will be needed by the year 2025. The 46 softball/baseball fields on school district properties should be further assessed to determine how they may meet a portion of this need.

This is higher than the current level of service, and is higher than average for other Oregon communities (1 field per 2,900 people). NRPA recommends a guideline of 1 field per 5,000 people. This figure is often regarded as inadequate considering the popularity of baseball and softball in the northwest.

### ***Tennis Courts***

Tennis courts are generally constructed in pairs or groupings of four or more. They are usually located at larger parks, such as community and/or metropolitan parks, or at high schools. Currently there are 23 City-owned tennis courts and four courts located at school sites. In general, City-owned paved courts are in fairly good condition, with average scores ranging from 2.0 to 3.0 (Appendix E). It is likely that potential improvements would be limited to hairline crack repairs and court resurfacing.

### ***Public Involvement Findings/Trends***

- Participation in tennis is higher in Eugene than the Northwest Average, according to the results of the Community Survey and the Youth Questionnaire.
- Tennis ranks 40<sup>th</sup> out of 50 activities in which Community Survey respondents participate. For youths, it ranked 28<sup>th</sup> out of 50 recreation activities, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- Nationally, participation in tennis has increased slightly (0.5%) since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- Outdoor tennis has decreased in Eugene by over 30% from 1987-2002 (OPRD, 2003).
- The River Road/Santa Clara sub-area has no City-owned tennis courts. The City Central sub-area has few tennis courts.

### ***Potential Partners***

Schools and other recreation providers, such as Willamalane Park and Recreation District, Lane County Parks, and River Road Park and Recreation District, are potential partners. Private providers, such as Willow Creek Tennis & Sports, Eugene Swim & Tennis Club, and the YMCA, are potential partners.

### ***Standards Analysis***

Excluding school facilities, the City currently provides a service level of one tennis court per 7,000 people (Table 3). If school facilities are included, the current level of service is 1 court per 5,900 people.



Design standards for certain types of parks generally include tennis courts as a basic element of park design. This usually occurs in the larger community parks and consists of pairs of courts. Based on an analysis of community service areas, we know there is a need for one additional community park. In addition, six of the existing community parks do not contain facilities of this nature. If two tennis courts were added to each of these sites, 14 additional courts would be provided. If this figure is added to the existing inventory of courts (23 areas) and divided into the future population, a proposed level of service of one tennis court per 5,700 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, 5 courts are currently needed and 14 courts will be needed by the year 2025. The 4 tennis courts on school district property should be further assessed to determine how they may meet a portion of this need.

This LOS is slightly higher than the current level of service of 1 court per 5,900 residents, but significantly lower than the average for many communities in Oregon (1 court per 2,100). NRPA also recommends a guideline of 1 court per 2,000 people.

### ***Wading Pools/Spray Parks***

Eugene currently has wading pools at 8 locations. Five of these sites are operated in conjunction with the Summer Fun for All program, which runs from late June through late August. Wading pools that exist at a three other sites, such as Amazon, have been discontinued due to maintenance needs and cuts to programming staff. All wading pools will eventually be decommissioned due to anticipated changes in public health regulations. The assumption has been that the City will utilize this as an opportunity to convert these facilities into spray pools. No specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of these facilities.

### ***Public Involvement Findings/Trends***

- Aquatic facilities (including swimming pools and spray parks) are the most needed recreation elements in Eugene, according to Speakers Bureau respondents answering an open-ended question.
- Developing additional park amenities, such as spray parks, was a priority service improvement identified at the LRCS All-staff Workshop.
- Wading pools will be decommissioned soon due to changes in state health regulations.
- Spray park components are proposed as part of a regional play area at Alton Baker Park and in the Bethel Community Park play area.

### ***Potential Partners***

Schools and other recreation providers, such as Willamalane Park and Recreation District, Lane County Parks, and River Road Park and Recreation District, are potential partners.

### ***Standards Analysis***

The City currently provides a service level of one wading pool per 20,000 people (Table 3).

For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, we will assume that one larger and one smaller spray park be developed in each of the six park planning sub-areas. Based on this assumption, a total of 12 areas will eventually be needed. If the projected 2025 population is divided by twelve, a proposed level of service of 1 spray park per 17,500 people can be derived. This results in a current need of one spray park, and a 2025 need of four. This is in addition to recommissioning of the existing wading pools.

This LOS is higher than the current level of service of 1 spray area/wading pool per 20,000 residents, reflecting the strong demand for aquatic facility improvements. No comparable standards have been developed for this type of amenity.



## B. Natural Area Amenities

The following natural area amenities are addressed in this report:

- Interpretive facilities
- Multi-use trails
- Mountain bike trails
- Pedestrian trails
- Running trails
- Trail heads

### ***Interpretive Facilities***

Currently, there are three City interpretive facilities located in the Eugene area. These are located at Alton Baker Park, Hendricks Park, and Meadowlark Prairie. No specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of these facilities. In addition, some facilities are located on BLM land in west Eugene.

### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Interpretive trails can combine a number of recreation activities that are among the top 20 most popular in Eugene: walking (4), wildlife watching (11), hiking (13), and bird watching (15).
- Adults ages 55+ rated the following recreation activities higher than the general community: walking (2), bird watching (7), and wildlife watching (8).
- Interpretive trails *provide opportunities to enjoy nature/outdoors*, which is the number one benefit of parks, recreation, and open space, according to the results of the Community Survey and the Eugene Celebration and Speakers Bureau Questionnaires.
- Outdoor/environmental programs are ranked as one of the top two types of programs that the City should increase, according to the Community Survey and the Speakers Bureau Report.
- The Natural Resource and Open Space Focus Group identified the following priority for meeting natural resource objectives: foster stewardship through improved public information and education, including better signage, park maps, and developing an environmental education center.
- The Multi-Cultural Focus Groups suggests interpreting diverse cultures in parks, natural areas, and facilities. This Focus Group also discussed the issue of safety and security in making natural areas more attractive to minority populations.
- Since 1987, participation in nature/wildlife observation has increased 253.9% in the Eugene region (OPRD, 2003).
- The following planning sub-areas have no interpretive facilities: City Central, River Road/Santa Clara, and Willow Creek.

### *Potential Partners*

Potential partners could include non-profits, such as The Nature Conservancy and Nearby Nature, other public agencies, including school districts, the University of Oregon, Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Army Corps of Engineers. Other potential partners include private organizations and service groups.

### *Standards Analysis*

In general, there is a need for additional interpretive facilities to respond to community priorities regarding natural area protection and environmental education. It is assumed that additional interpretive facilities would be developed at all major natural areas within the community. Some of these could include Delta Ponds, Skinner Butte, Wayne Morse Ranch, Amazon Headwaters, Bailey Hill and Spencer's Butte. For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, we will assume that six additional interpretive facilities could be developed. Based on this assumption, a total of 9



facilities will eventually be provided. If the projected 2025 population is divided by 9, a proposed level of service of 1 interpretive facility per 23,000 people can be derived. This results in a current need of four interpretive facilities, and a 2025 need of six.

This LOS is higher than the current level of service of 1 facility per 53,000 residents.

### **Trails**

For multi-use trails, mountain bike trails, and running trails, a formula was used to calculate need that was originally developed by the Washington State Interagency for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) and slightly modified by MIG. The model is based on the following:

Formula:  $\frac{A \times B \times C}{D \times E} = \text{xxx miles of trail presently needed}$

A = the per capita annual use rate obtained from the community survey for specific activities.

B = the percentage of individual who wish to use trails on average day. This information can be obtained from the community survey.

C = the percent of the population that uses trails. This information can be obtained from the community survey.

D = the number of participants encountered over a typical mile of trail. Generally, paved trails will have a higher value and unpaved trails will have a lower value.

E = the turnover rate, which is generally constant.

Where this formula is used, the variables used are described in the narrative.

### **Multi-use Trails**

Currently, there are 20.3 miles of multi-use trails in the Eugene planning area. These are used for a variety of purposes, such as walking, biking, and dog walking.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Bicycling for pleasure is the number one preferred recreation activity for respondents of the Community Survey. Based on rates of actual participation, people bicycled on average 2.25 times in a 30-day period, which is lower than the Northwest Average.
- Bicycling for pleasure ranked 9th out of 50 activities for youths, seniors (age 55+), and all respondents.
- Youth participated in bicycling on average 6.04 times in a 30-day period, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- According to the Community Survey, three of the top ten activities in Eugene are trail related: walking for pleasure, dog walking, and bicycling for pleasure.
- The age group most likely participate in walking frequently is seniors (65+).
- Overall, the community indicated a desire to spend more time bicycling for pleasure than they currently do.
- Community Survey respondents identified multi-purpose trails as the most needed outdoor recreation element. In an open-ended question, multi-purpose trails were ranked fourth as the facility most needing improvement.
- The Business Community Focus Group identified the extensive bike system and riverfront bike paths as examples of assets that contribute to the economic health of the Eugene community.



- Nationally, participation has increased since 2001 in the following activities associated with multi-use trails: bicycle riding (6.1%), scooter riding (5.6%), exercise walking (5.0%), and running/jogging (0.9%) (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003). On-road mountain biking has increased as well (8.7%).
- The SCORP recognizes a need for recreational trails and connectivity. Oregon has declared a statewide goal "to provide quality trail facilities and opportunities, including inter-connective opportunities where appropriate, to satisfy a growing number of diverse trail users throughout the state" (OPRD, 2003).
- All of the Eugene planning sub-areas have multi-use trails.

#### *Potential Partners*

Potential partners could include other City agencies and private organizations

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City currently provides over 20 miles of trail, providing a service level of 0.13 miles per 1,000 people (Table 3). Most planning sub-areas have 2-3 miles of trail currently. One area, Willakenzie, has 6.7 miles of trail due to multi-use trails at Alton Baker and Willamette East Bank Parks. Less than 5 additional miles of multi-use path are currently identified in TransPlan, the Eugene-Springfield Transportation System Plan.

There is no one method for calculating trail need. The following two methods are presented for discussion purposes:

- It could be reasonable to assume that the inventory could double by adding multi-use paths to existing parks and to newly acquired linear connections. For example, if each planning sub-area had 5 miles of trail, an additional 9.7 miles would be needed by 2025. This results in a proposed level of service of 0.14 miles per 1000.
- Based on the mathematical model described above, and using numerical values from the Community Survey, we can derive a level of service of 0.22 miles per 1,000. Based on this factor, an additional 15 miles are currently needed and 26 miles will be need by the year 2025.

Based on community priorities, the higher level of service of .22 miles per 1,000 is proposed. This level of service is higher than the current service level of .12 miles per 1,000 and higher than average for other Oregon communities.

Note: The following variables were used to calculated the need for multi-use trails using the mathematical model:

A. Total annual participation (2.25 per capita):	4,332,663 annual occasions <sup>(1)</sup>
B. Percent of use on average peak day:	2.0%
C. Percent who wish to use trail:	5%
D. Occasions per mile:	12
E. Turnover rate:	10

<sup>(1)</sup> Based on per capita use for Bicycling for Pleasure





### **Mountain Bike Trails**

Currently, there are 3.8 miles of mountain bike trails in the Eugene planning area. These types of trails are generally unpaved and offer a variety of challenges to the user.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Nationally, participation in off-road mountain biking has increased dramatically (12.6%) since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- Oregon has a much higher participation rate in on-road mountain biking compared to other states (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- South Eugene is the only planning sub-area with mountain bike trails.

#### *Potential Partners*

Potential partners could include private organizations and service groups, as well as local businesses such as sporting goods and bicycle retailers.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City currently provides a service level of 0.02 miles per 1,000 people (Table 3).

Based on the mathematical model, and using numerical values from the Community Survey, we can derive a level of service of 0.05 miles per 1,000. Based on this factor, an additional 4 miles are currently needed and 7 miles will be need by the year 2025.

The proposed level of service of 0.05 is higher than the current service level of 0.02 miles per 1,000.

Note: The following variables were used to calculate the need for mountain bike trails using the mathematical model:

A. Total annual participation (0.97 per capita):	1,867,859 occasions
B. Percent of use on average peak day:	2.0%
C. Percent who wish to use trail:	1%
D. Occasions per mile:	4
E. Turnover rate:	10

### **Pedestrian Trails**

Currently, there are 10.96 miles of pedestrian trails in the Eugene planning area. Most of these mapped trails are soft-surfaced hiking trails in the South Eugene sub-area. However, pedestrian trails also could include looped and linear routes in almost all park types. The existing trails are in poor to fair condition (Appendix E). There are also many informal and unmapped trails in City parks.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Walking for pleasure is the 4th most popular recreation activity out of 50 activities, according to the results of the Community Survey. Respondents indicated they would like to spend even more time walking.
- Youth ranked walking for pleasure 11<sup>th</sup> out of 50 recreation activities, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire.
- The Ridgeline Trail was identified by the Business Community Focus Group as a community asset that contributes to the economic health of the Eugene community.
- Nationally, participation in hiking has increased dramatically (17%) since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).



- Oregon has a much higher participation rate in hiking compared to other states (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- Since 1987, participation in day hiking has increased 20.7% in the Eugene region (OPRD, 2003).
- South Eugene is the only planning sub-area with significant mapped pedestrian trails.

#### *Potential Partners*

Potential partners could include other City agencies, schools, local recreation providers, local businesses and private organizations.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City currently provides a service level of 0.07 miles of pedestrian trails per 1,000 people (Table 3). Because the existing trail inventory is incomplete at this time, a proposed level of service for 2025 is not provided. It is recommended that the City maximize pedestrian trail opportunities in all existing parks and in all future parks. For significant natural areas, it is recommended that a site master plan be developed that specifies trail locations and construction techniques that minimize impacts to the resource. Such a plan also would evaluate existing unplanned (social) trails, and upgrade these trails to pedestrian trails or close them to use.

#### **Running Trails**

Currently, there are 11.82 miles of running trails in the Eugene planning area. Most of these are soft-surfaced trails between .25 and 1.5 miles in length.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Jogging/running is the 12th ranked recreation activity out of 50 activities, according to the results of the Community Survey. Respondents jogged on average 2.06 times in a 30-day period, which is lower than the Northwest Average.
- Youths participate in jogging/running even more frequently. According to the results of the Youth Questionnaire, youths jogged on average 6.27 times in a 30-day period. Jogging/running was among their top ten activities, ranking 7th out of 50 recreation activities.
- According to the Community Survey, youths ages 10-14 run or jog more frequently than any other age group.
- Nationally, participation in running/jogging has increased slightly (0.9%) since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- The following planning sub-areas lack running trails: City Central, River Road/Santa Clara, and Willow Creek.

#### *Potential Partners*

Potential partners could include local businesses, private organizations and service groups.

#### *Standards Analysis*

The City currently provides a service level of 0.07 miles per 1,000 people (Table 3).

Based on mathematical model using numerical values from the Community Survey, we can derive a level of service of 0.05 miles per 1,000. Based on this factor, no additional trails are currently needed and 3 miles will be needed by the year 2025.

Another possible method of analysis is to provide a minimum of 1 mile of running trail in each planning sub-area. It is possible that a soft-surfaced running trail could be added along an existing or new multi-use path in the Willow Creek, River Road, Central, and Bethel sub-areas. Based on this analysis, the need in the year 2025 is also 3 additional miles of trail.





The proposed level of service of 0.07 is comparable to the current service level of 0.07 miles per 1,000 and higher than average for other Oregon communities.

Note: The following variables were used to calculate the need for running trails using the mathematical model:

A. Total annual participation (2.06 per capita):	3,966,793 annual occasions
B. Percent of use on average peak day:	2.0%
C. Percent who wish to use trail:	3%
D. Occasions per mile:	20
E. Turnover rate:	10

### **Trail Heads**

Currently, there are 8 trailheads in the Eugene planning area. These are located at Amazon Headwaters Park, Blanton Ridge, Meadowlark Prairie, and Spencer's Butte.

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- During the community involvement process, it was noted that trail heads lack parking and other passive recreation amenities, such as benches, picnic areas, trash receptacles, restrooms, etc.
- People are not familiar with trail locations because marked trailheads are lacking, according to public involvement findings. The Maintenance Staff Focus Group specifically noted the need for improved trailhead signage.

#### *Potential Partners*

Potential partners could include private organizations and service groups.

#### *Standards Analysis*

Due to the significance of natural area parks within the Eugene parks and open space system, and the community demand for improved access to these sites, there is a need for additional trailheads. It is assumed these types of facilities would be developed at all major natural areas, particularly the larger ones such as Delta Ponds, Dragonfly Bend, Golden Gardens, Moon Mountain and Murray Hill. Because there are multiple opportunities for trailhead facilities at each of the natural area parks, no specific level of service has been proposed.

### **C. Recreation Facilities**

The recreation facilities addressed in this report include:

- Gymnasiums
- Indoor and outdoor swimming pools
- Community centers and senior centers

#### **Gymnasiums**

Gymnasiums can be developed in a variety of different sizes to accommodate different sports and varying age groups. Currently, there are no City-owned gyms, although small indoor sports areas are provided at Sheldon and Westmoreland Community Centers; however, there are 49 gyms located at local schools. No specific evaluation was conducted on the condition of the school facilities.



### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Gymnasiums can combine a number of recreation activities that are among the 20 most popular for youth in Eugene: basketball (5), exercising/aerobics (6), and soccer (14).
- Exercise/aerobics is among the top ten activities for all groups surveyed: youths aged 10-17, adults (55+), and the community overall.
- Basketball is the number one preferred activity for youths and the highest-ranking sports activity in the community overall, according to the results of the Youth Questionnaire and the Community Survey.
- Respondents in the Community Survey indicated they would like to spend more time playing basketball than they currently do. Current participation may be limited by the availability of indoor courts.
- According to the results of the Community Survey, indoor volleyball ranked 47th out of 50 activities in which the community participates. Youths participate in indoor volleyball more frequently, ranking it 39th out of 50, according to the Youth Questionnaire.
- A sports complex is the most needed sports facility in Eugene, according to 24.7% of the respondents to the Community Survey.
- According to the results of the Organized Sports Questionnaire, Eugene needs more gymnasiums.
- Creating weekend/evening activities for kids, such as midnight basketball, was rated an urgent item by participants at the Communities of Color Workshop.
- Nationally, there has been a dramatic increase in participation in weight lifting (17.4%), exercising with equipment (14.4%), and aerobic exercising (10.4%) since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- Nationally, participation in basketball has increased 3% since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- Oregon has a much higher participation rate in volleyball compared to other states (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003). However, participation has declined 4.8% nationally and 30% locally (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003; OPRD, 2003).
- The City has no gymnasiums.
- The School District has a major capital improvement program underway that has impacted the quantity and availability of gymnasiums. Several schools are proposed for disposal, and a number of schools will be under construction over the next 20 years as part of this work.

### *Potential Partners*

Schools and the private sector are important potential partners.

### *Standards Analysis*

Since the City does not own any gymnasiums, there is no current level of service for city gyms (Table 3). If school facilities are included, the current level of service is 1 court per 3,300 people.

It is assumed each gymnasium can provide at a minimum one court per gym. Currently, there are 49 gymnasiums, which can accommodate thirty-four (34) games/practices per court per week for a total supply of 1,666 games/practices per week. Assuming two games and two practices a week, the 897 teams (adult high school, and youth basketball, youth and adult volleyball) create a demand of 1,794 games/practices a week. This is based on the understanding that teams are sharing court time for practice.



Based on a supply and demand analysis, there is a shortage of 128 games/practices a week. Since one court can accommodate (34) games/practices a week, there is a shortage of four courts. If the current shortage (4 courts) is added to the existing inventory of 49 courts, there is a net need for 53 courts at the present time. If the current population is divided by the net need, a proposed service level of one court per 3,000 can be derived. Based on this level of service, 4 gyms (courts) are currently needed and 32 gyms (courts) will be needed by the year 2025. The proposed level of service of 1 per 3,000 is slightly higher than the current level of service.

### ***Indoor/Outdoor Swimming Pools***

Currently, there are three pools in the Eugene planning area, including Amazon, Sheldon, and Echo Hollow. Amazon Pool is a seasonal outdoor facility, Sheldon is a year-round indoor pool, and Echo Hollow is a year-round pool with indoor and outdoor components. According to the *Facility Condition Report*, all three aquatic facilities are in good condition (Appendix G).

### ***Public Involvement Findings/Trends***

- For middle school and high school youths, swimming pools are the second most frequently used recreation facility in Eugene. Youth averaged 5.91 visits annually, according to the Youth Questionnaire.
- According to the Community Survey, youths aged 10-14 swim more frequently than any other age group.
- Outdoor swimming ranked 8<sup>th</sup> and indoor swimming ranked 12<sup>th</sup> out of 50 activities in which youths participate, according to the Youth Questionnaire.
- According to the Community Survey, respondents averaged 3.36 per capita visits to the pool annually. Pools ranked 6<sup>th</sup> out of 10 facilities in terms of use.
- In the community overall, outdoor swimming ranked 23<sup>rd</sup> and indoor swimming ranked 26<sup>th</sup> out of 50 activities in which people participate.
- Residents would like to participate in indoor and outdoor swimming more than they currently do, according to the Community Survey. However, current swimming participation in Eugene is lower than the Northwest Average. Participation may be lower than average in Eugene because of a lack of facilities.
- Respondents to the Community Survey ranked a swimming pool as the second most needed sports facility in Eugene, just after a sports field complex.
- Youth Questionnaire respondents identified a swimming pool as the top sports facility needed by youths in Eugene.
- In the Speakers Bureau Questionnaire, aquatic facilities were the top need identified for specific indoor and outdoor recreation facilities.
- In an open-ended question, *provide additional aquatic facilities* was the fifth most frequently mentioned improvement overall for all parks, open space, and recreation services, according to Speakers Bureau respondents.
- Renovating existing pools, building more pools, and expanding pool hours were priority service improvements identified at the LRCS All-staff Workshop.
- Six percent of the respondents in the Community Survey listed *provide additional aquatic facilities* among the top 3 most needed improvements in Eugene.
- Swimming and water-based exercise is especially beneficial to seniors and people with temporary and long-term disabilities, given its low physical impacts.
- Seniors and people with disabilities also benefit from warm water pools.



- Nationally, participation in swimming has declined 0.2% since 2001 (National Sporting Goods Association, 2003).
- The SCORP identifies a need for swimming in outdoor pools in Region 2 and 3, which includes Eugene (OPRD, 2003).
- Since 1987, participation in swimming in outdoor pools has decreased 44.8% in the Eugene region (OPRD, 2003).
- Aquatic facilities are not available in all areas of the City and current hours of operation are limited. Participation in swimming and expansion of aquatic programs may be limited by facility space.
- The following sub-areas have no City-owned swimming pools: City Central, River Road/Santa Clara, and Willow Creek. The River Road Parks & Recreation District provides a year-round indoor pool in the River Road area.

#### *Potential Partners*

Other recreation providers, such as Willamalane Park and Recreation District and River Road Park and Recreation District, the private sector, non-profit organizations, and schools are potential partners.

#### *Standards Analysis*

Currently, the level of service for City-owned pools is one pool per 53,500 people.

For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, we propose that one swimming pool be provided in each of the six park planning sub-areas. Recognizing that the River Road/Santa Clara sub-area is being served by the River Road Park and Recreation District pool, two additional city owned pools are needed to achieve this goal. If the River Road pool is included a proposed level of service of one pool per 35,000 people can be derived. Based on this level of service, one additional pool is currently needed and 2 pools will be needed by the year 2025. The City should consider developing pools in the City Central and Willow Creek areas as the population grows. Additionally, year-round service for all areas should be addressed by considering upgrades to Amazon Pool to weatherize the facility, and by developing new facilities with indoor and outdoor pool areas.

This LOS is higher than the current level of service of one pool per 53,500 residents. NRPA recommends a guideline of one pool per 20,000 people.

#### ***Community/Senior Centers***

Currently, there are ten facilities that provide some of the functions of community centers in the Eugene area. However, only five (Amazon, Sheldon, Campbell, Peterson Barn and Hilyard) provide any significant programming space, and all of these are smaller than the 35,000 square foot facilities typically developed today. McNail/Riley, River House, Trude Kaufman, Washington, and Westmoreland provide only limited meeting space. According to the *Facility Condition Report*, all of the City's community and neighborhood centers are in good condition overall (Appendix G).

#### *Public Involvement Findings/Trends*

- Community centers can combine a number of recreation activities that are among the top 30 most popular for youths in Eugene: watching TV/videos (1), computers (2), reading for pleasure (3), playing musical instruments (4), family activities (10), photography (20), arts and crafts (22), gourmet cooking (25), and dancing (26).
- The age group most likely to use community centers frequently is youths aged 10-14. A large part of community center programming targets this age group and younger.



- Nearly one-third of respondents in the Youth Questionnaire indicated they would be most comfortable attending recreation activities at school. School properties frequently function as community centers for youths and their families.
- According to the Community Survey, the top 4 groups in need of more or better recreation services are in order: middle school youths 12-14, high school youths 15-18, elementary school youths 6-11, and seniors 55 and over.
- According to the Community Survey, the top 3 indoor community buildings needed in Eugene are: multi-use community center (42.4%), a teen center (33.1%), and a senior center (12.6%).
- Community centers are used less frequently than most other parks and community facilities. According to the Community Survey, respondents averaged 1.22 per capita visits annually. Youths averaged 2.93 visits annually.
- Senior centers are currently the least used type of park and community facility, according to the results of the Community Survey, respondents averaged 0.56 per capita visits annually.
- The national trend is toward community centers that serve all age groups rather than single age group facilities, such as senior centers. In addition, many senior centers are changing their names to make them more inviting to broader age groups.
- *Providing additional community and recreation centers* ranked 8<sup>th</sup> out 11 choices overall for the most significant parks, recreation, and open space improvement needed in Eugene.
- In an open-ended question in the Speakers Bureau Questionnaire, respondents named *providing additional community and recreation centers* frequently enough to rank it as the 7<sup>th</sup> overall recreation element most needed in Eugene.
- *Developing a system of neighborhood-based community centers* for all ages and abilities is a top priority issue, according to comments gathered at the LRCS All-staff Workshop.
- *Community centers* are one of the primary needs of people in Eugene, according to the Recreation and Social Service Provider Focus Group.
- The Multi-Cultural Focus Group suggests that a multi-purpose community center targeting people of diverse cultures would provide a forum for learning about cultural traditions, a gathering place for people of all ages and cultures, and a setting to celebrate cultural diversity.
- Integrating a multi-cultural focus into specific community centers is a most urgent item, according to participants at the Communities of Color Workshop.
- The lack of a Community Center and other facilities in the downtown core, Whitaker area, or other underserved communities is an example of geographic, racial, ethnic, and class discrimination, according to participants at the Communities of Color Workshop.
- Community centers are not available in all areas of the City, and current hours of operation are limited. These factors may limit program offerings and prohibit program expansion.
- The River Road/Santa Clara and Willow Creek sub-areas have no City-owned community centers or senior centers.

#### *Potential Partners*

Other recreation providers, such as Willamalane Park and Recreation District and River Road Park and Recreation District, the private sector, non-profit organizations, and schools are potential partners.



### *Standards Analysis*

Currently, the level of service for community centers is one center per 16,000 people.

For purposes of deriving a proposed level of service, a minimum suggested standard could be one major community center in each planning area. This suggests a proposed level of service of one per 20,000 people. Based on this level of service no additional centers are needed at the present time and 1-2 will be needed to meet the 2025 population. River Road/Santa Clara is currently at least partially served by River Road Recreation and Park District. The Willow Creek sub-area is not currently served. The proposed LOS is slightly greater than the current level of service of one center per 17,800 residents.

For a more detailed analysis, major community centers could be isolated from miscellaneous meeting facilities. Core recreation services for community center programs could be identified along with their space requirements. Using this space allocation model, existing community center space in each planning sub-area could be evaluated on a more detailed basis. Possible partnership opportunities, such as school district facilities, could be evaluated in the model.

## **D. General Observations**

### ***Maintenance and Operations***

Overall, the maintenance and operation of the park system appears to be fair to good. A majority of the park amenities were rated fair or better.

### ***Accessibility***

The City has an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plan for major city buildings and facilities. However, an ADA transition plan has not been developed for parks and recreation facilities. The federal agency charged with developing ADA standards, the Access Board, has recently released new guidelines for a number of recreation facilities, including boating facilities, fishing piers and platforms, golf courses, exercise equipment, and swimming pools and spas. Additional guidelines are being finalized for trails and natural area amenities. More information about the ADA guidelines and the Access Board can be found at <http://www.access-board.gov>.

### ***Irrigation***

The average rating for irrigation ranged from 2.0 to 3.0, which would suggest that most systems are operating properly and have fairly good coverage. (Appendix E). The evaluation indicated that irrigation systems in neighborhood and metropolitan parks are in need of the most improvements.

### ***Lighting***

Site lighting received scores ranging from 1.0 to 2.3, suggesting that many of the lighting systems are in need of repair or are inoperable (Appendix E). Community parks received the highest overall rating. Linear parks, along with neighborhood and metropolitan parks, require the most improvements.

### ***Off-street Parking***

The average rating for the parking facilities ranged from 1.2 to 2.0, which would indicate the parking is adequate but requires resurfacing or other types of improvement (Appendix E). Parking facilities at community and metropolitan parks received the highest rating. In contrast, parking at neighborhood facilities received the lowest rating. Generally, off-street parking is not provided in neighborhood parks.

### ***Park Structures***

According to the Facility Condition Report, many support or maintenance structures are in good condition (Appendix G). Notable exceptions include the potting shed at Hendricks Park, the two



storage buildings at Petersen Park, and the storage garage and maintenance building at the Laurelwood Golf Course. Most park shelters are in good condition as well.

### ***Planting***

The average rating for planting/shrubs ranged from 1.7 to 3.0, which indicates that landscaping may require some renovation (Appendix E). Neighborhood and metropolitan parks need the most work.

### ***Public Art***

Public art is located in many City parks and recreation facilities. However, only art funded by the 1% for Art fund is inventoried. The City should develop a complete inventory of public art located in City parks and facilities.

### ***Restrooms***

According to the *Facility Condition Report*, most restroom facilities are in good condition (Appendix G). Notable exceptions include men's and women's restrooms at Tugman Park and the facilities at Fairmont Park. However, these restrooms are slated for improvements in the near future.

### ***Signage***

The average rating for signage ranged from 1.0 to 1.6, which means substantial improvements are needed. Signs may be damaged, old, or in some cases, non-existent (Appendix E).

### ***Site Furnishings***

Based on the amenity evaluation, ratings for site amenities ranged from 2.0 to 2.2. Site furnishings are in fairly good condition (Appendix E).

### ***Turf Areas***

The average rating for turf ranged from 1.5 to 3.0 (Appendix E). This would indicate there are turf areas that need re-seeding, fertilization, or weeding.





#### IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Society for Testing and Materials (2001). *ASTM F 1487 Safety Performance Specifications for Playground Equipment for Public Use Manual*. [www.astm.org](http://www.astm.org)

City of Eugene (1973). *South Hills Study*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1982). *Bethel-Danebo Refinement Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1982). *Fairmont/University of Oregon Special Area Study*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1982). *Jefferson/Far West Refinement Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1982). *The Laurel Hill Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1982). *West University Refinement Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1982). *Willow Creek Special Area Study*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1987). *Westside Neighborhood Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1992). *Willakenzie Area Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1996). *Eugene Local Street Plan*. Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (1998). *Eugene Growth Management Study – Adopted Policies*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (2002). *Draft Royal Avenue Specific Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (2003). *FY 04 Adopted Operating Budget*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (2003). *LRCS Community Connections: A Focus Group with Leaders of Communities of Color. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene (2003). *2001 – 2002 Vision and Goals Statement*.  
[www.ci.eugene.or.us/Council/goals2001.htm](http://www.ci.eugene.or.us/Council/goals2001.htm).

City of Eugene (2003). *Draft Capital Improvement Program FY 2004 – 2009*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene

City of Eugene, City of Springfield, Lane County Land Management Division (1982). *Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. Lane Council of Governments.

City of Eugene, Facility Management Division (2001). *Facility Condition Report*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene, Library, Recreation and Cultural Services. (1996). *Amazon Pool Feasibility Study*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene, LCOG. (2001). *Draft City of Eugene Stream Corridor Acquisition Study*. Eugene, Oregon. Lane Council of Governments.





City of Eugene, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services. (1989). *Eugene Parks and Recreation Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene, Planning Department. (1987). *Entrance Beautification Study*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene, Planning and Development Department (2000). *Bethel-Danebo Neighborhood Scoping Report*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.

City of Eugene and Lane County (May 2000). *West Eugene Wetlands Plan*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene and LCOG.

David Reed and Associates (January 2000). *Hendricks Park Forest Management Plan*. Eugene, Oregon.

Department of Land Conservation and Development (1995). *Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines*. Department of Land Conservation and Development.

Environmental Studies Service Learning Program, University of Oregon (July 2002). *Spencer Butte Recreational Impact Study*. Eugene, Oregon. Environmental Studies Service Learning Program, University of Oregon.

Environmental Studies Service Learning Program, University of Oregon (October 2002). *Spencer Butte Recreational Impact Study Addendum: Summer Use Patterns*. Eugene, Oregon. Environmental Studies Service Learning Program, University of Oregon.

Eugene Public Works Department and LCOG (June 1996). *Parks, Open Spaces, and Natural Areas Study: A Report to the Eugene City Council*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene and LCOG.

Lane County Parks Division (January 1999). *Parks 2005 Plan*. Springfield, Oregon. Lane County Parks Division.

Lane Council of Governments (June 1995). *How Do We Grow From Here? A Guide to Proposed Land Use Strategies and Design Concepts for the Eugene-Springfield Area Transportation Plan*. Eugene – Springfield Metropolitan Area. LCOG.

Lane Council of Governments (October 2001). *Open Space Acquisition Funding and Protection Strategies*. Eugene – Springfield Metropolitan Area. LCOG.

Lane Council of Governments (October 3, 2001). *Draft Inventory for the Metropolitan Natural Resources Study*. Eugene – Springfield Metropolitan Area. LCOG.

Lane Council of Governments (December 2001). *Metropolitan Regional Parks and Open Space Study Quarterly Update Memorandum*. Eugene – Springfield Metropolitan Area. LCOG.

Lane Council of Governments (December 2001). *TransPlan: The Eugene-Springfield Transportation System Plan*. Eugene – Springfield Metropolitan Area. LCOG.

Lane Council of Governments (June 2003). *Rivers to Ridges Metropolitan Regional Parks and Open Space Study: Vision and Strategies*. Eugene – Springfield Metropolitan Area. LCOG.

Lane Council of Governments (March 2003). *Eugene Population, Demographic and Economic Trends. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan*. Eugene – Springfield Metropolitan Area. LCOG.



- McKenzie Watershed Council (January 2002). *The McKenzie River Watershed Conservation Strategy*.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Community Survey Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2002). *Eugene Celebration Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Financial Analysis Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Library, Recreation and Cultural Services All-Staff Workshop Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Maintenance Staff Focus Group Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Multi-Cultural Focus Group Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Natural Resource and Open Space Focus Group Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Organized Sports Questionnaire Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Recreation and Social Service Provider Focus Group Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Speakers Bureau Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Stakeholder Interviews Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- MIG, Inc. (2003). *Youth Questionnaire Report*. Park, Recreation, and Open Space Comprehensive Plan. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene.
- National Sporting Goods Association (NSGA) (2003). *Sports Participation in 2002*. Mt. Prospect, Illinois. National Sporting Goods Association. [www.nsga.org](http://www.nsga.org).
- Oregon Employment Department (2000). *2000 Regional Economic Profile, Region 5 Lane County*. Salem, Oregon. Oregon Employment Department, Research and Analysis.
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department (OPRD) (2003). *Oregon Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan 2003-2007*. Salem, Oregon. State of Oregon.
- Robertson/Sherwood/Architects PC (2004). *Conceptual Master Plan: Echo Hollow Swimming Pool Summary Report*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene Facilities Management.
- Robertson/Sherwood/Architects PC (2004). *Conceptual Master Plan: Sheldon Pool and Community Center Summary Report*. Eugene, Oregon. City of Eugene Facilities Management.



- U.S. Access Board (1999). *Regulatory Negotiation Committee on Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas, Final Report*. U.S. Access Board. <http://www.access-board.gov/outdoor/outdoor-rec-rpt.htm>
- United Way of Lane County (2003). *State of Caring Report*. Springfield, Oregon. United Way of Lane County. [www.unitedwaylane.org/caring](http://www.unitedwaylane.org/caring).
- U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (U.S. ATBCB) (1998). *ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (ADAAG)*. Access Board; Washington.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2002). *United States Census 2000*. United States Department of Commerce. <http://www.census.gov/>
- U.S. Consumer Products Safety Commission (1997). *Handbook for Public Playground Safety* [www.cpsc.gov/cpscpub/pubs/325.pdf](http://www.cpsc.gov/cpscpub/pubs/325.pdf)
- West Eugene Wetlands Education Center and Willamette Resource and Education Network. (January 2002). *West Eugene Wetlands Education Center*. Eugene, Oregon. West Eugene Wetlands Education Center and Willamette Resource and Education Network.

